

THE ADOPTION OF RUSSIAN CONJUNCTIONS IN UDMURT

Inna Kaysina

University of Bremen

Abstract. Conjunctions in Udmurt belong to grammatical function words of secondary origin. Indigenous Udmurt linking devices have developed from other parts of speech e.g. postpositions and particles. Besides, a group of Russian and Tatar conjunctions has been taken over as a result of intensive contact with the two neighbouring languages. This paper will be dealing with the adoption of Russian coordinators and subordinators in Modern Udmurt. Russian linking elements are analysed within the code-copying framework (Johanson 2002) and are considered to be copied function units, accordingly. The role of Russian in the development of coordinate and subordinate structures in Udmurt is discussed to account for the on-going changes in the language structure of the colloquial variety.

Keywords: language contact, code copying, coordinators, subordinators, language structure, Udmurt, Russian

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.12697/jeful.2013.4.2.07>

1. Introduction

Modern Udmurt possesses a wide range of conjunctions that connect various sentence types. Like in other Permic languages, however, conjunctions in Udmurt are function words of secondary origin that developed, for the most part, under the influence of Russian (Csúcs 2005: 308, Lytkin et al. 1976: 210). Coordinating conjunctions belong to the first connecting elements adopted by Udmurt, thus replacing asyndetically combined sentences (Kalašnikova 1974: 9–12). The need to establish the norms of written literary Udmurt as well as to translate Russian literature in the beginning of the 20th century led to the appearance of complex sentence structures of the Russian type which presupposed the use of linking devices. As a result, alongside non-finite verbal constructions, which used to be more typical of Udmurt, different kinds of subordinate clauses were introduced that were marked by interrogative pronouns and conjunctions (Baušev 1929: 25–40, Lytkin et al. 1976: 210). The latter were either taken over from Russian and Tatar or, in the majority of cases, developed from Udmurt pronouns, postpositions and particles following the

Russian patterns (Baušev 1929: 25–40, Csúcs 2005: 308, Lytkin et al. 1976: 210, and Serebrennikov 1963: 375–377).

The aim of this paper is to study the use of Russian conjunctions in Modern Udmurt as well as to analyse their role in the development of Udmurt linking function words.

2. Theoretical framework and methodology

In the following, Russian conjunctions used in Udmurt will be analysed within Johanson's (2002) code-copying framework. In accordance with Johanson (2002: 289–290), Russian and Udmurt are considered a model and a basic linguistic code respectively, i.e. Russian elements are copied and inserted into Udmurt. The term “copying” comprises both “borrowing” and “calquing” from traditional contact linguistic approaches. Global copying refers to the insertion of a function unit as a whole, whereas in case of selective copying only some structural properties of an element, such as meaning or function, are taken over. Furthermore, the traditional distinction between “borrowing” and “code-switching” does not exist in the code-copying frame as well. The process of habitualization and conventionalization of a copy is diachronic in its nature and is understood more as a continuum instead.

The copying of Russian function words by Udmurt will be labelled “adoption”. This term is used by Johanson (2002: 290–291) to indicate copying from a socially-dominant to a socially-dominated code in a situation of asymmetric language contact. Since diglossia and unidirectional bilingualism are the main characteristics of the socio-linguistic situation in Udmurtia today (for more details see e.g. Winkler 2001: 5–6), Russian influence on Udmurt will be understood as adoption, which implies language change towards the model code.

The analysis of copied connecting devices from Russian is based on a corpus of Modern Udmurt comprised of written and spoken data. Literary Udmurt is represented by novels and stories written by contemporary Udmurt authors (Appendix 1). The spoken part of the corpus consists of 6 hours of spontaneous conversations, involving 20 native speakers of Udmurt aged 16–60 from different educational backgrounds. The data were recorded in the Northern, Central and Southern parts of the Udmurt Republic in July and August 2011.

3. Coordination

Three types of coordinate sentences are found in Modern Udmurt, namely copulative, contrastive and disjunctive (Vaxrušev et al. 1974: 10). The adoption of Russian conjunctions can be stated in all the coordinate structures mentioned above. Thus, the copulative conjunction *no* ‘and’ can be considered a copied Russian element, although its precise etymology is controversial. Some claim that *no* was taken over from Russian with all its meanings, i.e. as an intensifying particle, a copulative conjunction and a contrastive conjunction (Kalašnikova 1968: 146–148, Nasibullin 1998: 42). Since the Russian coordinator bears only the contrastive connotation in the model language, it has been speculated that, once borrowed, *no* has acquired several functions and has become a “universal” coordinator (Kalašnikova 1974: 14), which is explained by the widely spread polyfunctionality of conjunctions. Others, on the contrary, relate the copulative *no* to the Proto-Permic particle *nəŋta* ‘more, yet’ and point out Russian influence only in case of the contrastive coordinator (Serebrennikov 1963: 375).

In fact, even if one follows the second view on the etymology of *no*, it still seems plausible to admit the role of Russian in the development of the copulative conjunction. As the examples below indicate, there exist several parallels in the use of the Udmurt *no* and Russian *i* ‘and’:

- (1) Udmurt (Malyx 2010: 8)

Mjn-am vañ kjšno-je no nıl-j.
 I-GEN COP.PRS wife-1SG.POSS and daughter-1SG.POSS
 ‘I have a wife and a daughter.’
 Russian
U menja jest žena i doč.
 by me COP.PRS wife and daughter
 ‘I have a wife and a daughter.’

- (2) Udmurt (Darali Leli 2009: 9)

Berjtsk-i no, vjl-a-m bjdes vedra
 turn-PST.1SG and top-ILL-1SG whole bucket
kežjt vu omjrsk-i-z.
 cold water overturn-PST-3SG
 ‘I turned and a whole bucket of cold water was thrown over me.’
 Russian
Ja obernu-l-a-s, i na menja
 I turn-PST-F-REFL and on me

oprokinu-l-o-s' cel-oje vedro xolodn-oj vod-y.
 overturn-PST-N-REFL whole-N bucket cold-GEN.F water-GEN
 'I turned and a whole bucket of cold water was thrown over me.'

Apart from linking conjuncts in simple sentences (1) and coordinate parts of complex sentences (2), which, as a rule, reflect a succession of events in Udmurt (Vaxrušev et al. 1974: 12), *no* is also used as an intensifying-inclusive focus particle. Thus, in (3) the adverb *soku* is modified by *no*. The same function is performed by Russian *i* in the corresponding Russian sentence. The only difference, namely the prepositive or postpositive site of the particle, can be plausibly explained by the morphosyntactic characteristics (agglutinative SOV vs. inflectional SVO) of the languages involved.

- (3) Udmurt (Panfilova 2008: 16)

Mon soku no ej berd-j.
 I then even NEG.PST.1SG cry-PST.1SG
 'Even then I didn't cry.'

Russian

Ja i togda ne reve-l-a.
 I even then NEG cry-PST-F
 'Even then I didn't cry.'

No in (4) is considered to be a coordinating conjunction, which, at the same time, bears the meaning of an intensifying particle (Vaxrušev et al. 1974: 11). The focus is put on the pronoun *tjñid* by the particle *no*, meaning inclusion of a person into a group. Besides, *no* combines the two statements in analogy to its Russian equivalent.

- (4) Udmurt (Panfilova 2008: 14)

Vañdi-lj tau. Tjñ-jd no Miša.
 everyone-DAT thank you-DAT and (also) Misha.
 'Thank you everyone. And you too Misha.'

Russian

Vse-m spasibo. I teb-e Miša.
 everyone-DAT thank and you-DAT Misha.
 'Thank you everyone. And you too Misha.'

Similar to Russian *i* Udmurt *no* is a constituent part of the coordinating correlative (5) as well as the subordinating concessive conjunction (6):

(5) Udmurt (Malyx 2010: 12)

Soiz no, taiz no, dir.
 this and that and probably
 ‘Probably both, this and that.’

Russian

I to, i drugoe, naverno.
 and that and other probably
 ‘Probably both, this and that.’

(6) Udmurt (Badretidinov 2007: 10)

Čemyś višyl-i-z ke no,
 often be.ill-PST-3SG although and (even)
kuražem-z-e milem-lj ez vožmat-ja.
 suffering-3SG.POSS-ACC we-DAT NEG.PST.3SG show-PST.3SG
 ‘Even though she was often ill, she didn’t show us her sufferings.’

Russian

I xotja ona často bole-l-a,
 and although she often be.ill-PST-F
ona ne pokazyva-l-a nam svoix stradanij.
 she NEG show-PST-F us her sufferings
 ‘Even though she was often ill, she didn’t show us her sufferings.’

A few uses of Udmurt *no* which do not resemble any function of Russian *i*, and thus seem to be genuinely Udmurt, are restricted, for instance, to the intensification of negative and indefinite pronouns and adverbs (*nomjr no* ‘nothing’, *kin ke no* ‘someone’, etc.) as well as to the reinforcement of adjectival or adverbial meanings (*tuž no tuž* ‘very much’).

Consequently, *no* can be considered a selective copy whose form goes back to the Proto-Permic particle, whereas the functions have been adopted from Russian. First used as an intensifier, it then acquired the meanings of a focus particle, a copulative coordinator and a correlative conjunction under Russian influence. The selective character of copying is also seen in the positioning of *no* after the element it modifies (3, 4) or at the end of a clause (2, 6) which contrasts with the element- or clause-initial position of Russian *i*, with the result being that the original word order is preserved.

As for Russian *i* as a global copy, it is also relatively common in Modern Udmurt, at least in its spoken informal register:

(7) Udmurt (spoken data)

Ton gožja, i tɨn-eštj-d so-je vańzj lǝž-o-zj.
 you write.IMP and you-ABL-2SG it-ACC everyone read-FUT-3PL
 ‘Write and everyone will read it.’

It is either used to link conjuncts (7) or performs a function of a discourse marker, which “coordinates idea units and continues a speaker’s action” (Shiffrin 1987: 128):

(8) Udmurt (spoken data)

Mon prosto nu važ-ges dɨr bǝž-i,
 I just well early-COMPARATIVE maybe marry-PST.1SG
xotja umoj dǝšet-sk-i, bǝž-i.
 although good study-PST.1SG marry-PST.1SG
I mon so ulon-in nokǝžj
 and I this life-IN not.at.all
nu ne vopliti-l-a...
 well NEG fulfill-PST-F (Russian)
 ‘Maybe I just married too early, although I was good at school, I married too early. And I didn’t fulfill myself in this life at all.’

The group of contrastive conjunctions in Udmurt is represented by a series of global copies, namely *a* ‘and, but’, *no* ‘but’, *tol’ko* ‘only’, *ato* ‘otherwise’. Like in the model language combinations of coordinators with particles frequently occur, e.g. *a ved’*, *a vot*, *no ved’*, *no tol’ko*, which, in their turn, were also taken over from Russian and can be used separately. All contrastive coordinators occupy a clause-initial position (9) with the exception of *no*, which can also close a clause (10):

(9) Udmurt (Skobelev 2006: 71)

Ben, mon uža-ško, no końdon tǝr-o
 yes I work-PRS.1SG but money pay-PRS.3PL
tuž iči.
 very little
 ‘Yes, I work but they pay too little money.’

(10) Udmurt (Malýx 2010: 20)

Kotmar šu no, mon ton-e jarati-ško.
 anything say.IMP but I you-ACC love-PRS.1SG
 ‘Say what you want but I love you.’

The clause-final use of contrastive *no* is considered to be influenced by the more frequently occurring copulative *no* whose position is invariably postpositive (Vaxrušev et al. 1974: 31).

In literary Udmurt, the Russian copies *a* and *no* compete with their Udmurt equivalent *noš* which is again related to the Proto-Permic particle *nešta* ‘more, yet’ (Kalašnikova 1968: 142, Serebrennikov 1963: 375). Although all three conjunctions can be used synonymously, Udmurt *noš* and Russian *a* tend more to express adversative relations rather than simply contrast ideas, which is more characteristic of Russian *no* (Vaxrušev et al. 1974: 26–34):

(11) Udmurt (Panfilova 2008: 49)

Mon jalan osk-i: mi eš-jos gine lu-o-my.
 I always believe-PST.1SG we friend-PL just be-FUT-1PL
Noš so jarat-i-z, leša.
 whereas he love-PST-3SG seem
 ‘I always believed we would be just friends, whereas he seemed to love (me).’

Among the disjunctive conjunctions in Udmurt there are global copies from Russian (*libo* ‘or’, *ili* ‘or’), Tatar (*ja* ‘or’, *jake* ‘or’) and the indigenous Udmurt form *olo* developed from the modal word *olo* ‘maybe’ (Serebrennikov 1963: 375–376). Except *ili* ‘or’, whose usage is restricted to informal spoken Udmurt, all the disjunctive devices co-exist in the literary register as the following example illustrates:

(12) Udmurt (Panfilova 2008: 17)

Šu-o-m, tani mon škola-jš ogšorj djšetiš.
 say-FUT-1PL here I school-EL simple teacher
Jake, šu-o-m, mon šajan žurnalist.
 or say-FUT-1PL I witty journalist
Libo mon suredaš, kjržaš. **Olo** noš anaj.
 or I painter singer or yet mother
 ‘Let’s say I am a simple school teacher. Or let’s say I am a witty journalist. Or I am a painter, a singer. Or yet a mother.’

Udmurt disjunctive conjunctions are often found as correlative pairs (*jake...jake*, *olo...olo* ‘either...or’). Besides, the global copies of Russian correlative conjunctions are widely used (*koť...koť* ‘whether...or’, *ne to...ne to*, *to li...to li* ‘either...or’, *to...to* ‘sometimes...sometimes’).

In summary, under the influence of their Russian equivalents serving as models, Udmurt coordinating structures have been developed either through global or selective copying of linking devices.

4. Subordination

Modern Udmurt possesses two types of subordination: via indigenous non-finite constructions and via subordinate structures built in analogy with Russian subordinate clauses (Lytkin et al. 1976: 210, Šutov 2002: 8). The prolonged and intensive contact with Russian has led to the more frequent usage of sentences employing conjunctions and, consequently, to the lesser occurrence of non-finite forms (Kel'makov 2000: 50), which suggests that the Finno-Ugric syntactic system type is being replaced by that of Russian. Parallel to the adoption of subordinate structures, subordinators of different kinds were taken over either as selective or as global copies to combine parts of complex sentences.

Following the Russian pattern, interrogative pronouns and adverbs are widely used to link relative, adverbial and complement clauses with the main components of subordinate structures (Baušev 1929: 25–40, Csúcs 2005: 308, and Serebrennikov 1963: 377). Thus they present a case of selective copying:

- (13) Udmurt (Skobelev 2006: 123)

Mati nŋrjšetj-jez pijaš, kudiz Veri-jez jarat-e.
 Mati first-DET boy who Veri-ACC love-PRS.3SG
 'Mati is the first boy who loves Veri.'

Russian

Mati pervyj junoša, kotoryj ljub-it Veri.
 Mati first boy who love-PRS.3SG Veri
 'Mati is the first boy who loves Veri.'

Another example of structural resemblance between Udmurt and corresponding Russian complex sentences is the use of interrogative pronouns or adverbs marking subordinated clauses together with their correlates in the main clause (Baušev 1929: 24):

- (14) Udmurt (Panfilova 2008: 42)

Kižj malpa-j, ožj ik lu-o-z.
 how think.up-PST.1SG so become-FUT-3SG
 'It will be the way I decided.'

Russian

Kak ja zaduma-l-a, **tak** i bud-et.
 how I think.up-PST-F so become-FUT.3SG
 'It will be the way I decided.'

As for subordinating conjunctions in Udmurt, several of them belong to Permic forms which were originally used as particles and postpositions (*ke* 'if', *bere* 'if', *dirja* 'when', etc.) and have preserved their position at the end of a clause or after a clause constituent they modify (Serebrennikov 1963: 376–377, Winkler 2001: 63). Another group of subordinators consists of Russian global copies that not only have the same form and functions as their models but are also positioned clause-initially. Among them are the complementizers *čto* 'that' *čtobj* 'so that' and adverbial subordinators *potomu čto* 'because', *jesli* 'if', *raz* 'as', *kot' xot'*¹, *xotja* 'although':

(15) Udmurt (spoken data)

No alama, **čto** angliski-jez evel.
 but bad that English-ACC NEG.COP
Kule naverno angliskij bolše dišetijnj.
 necessary probably English more teach
potomu čto kotkijn no angliskij kıl.
 because everywhere English language
 'But it is bad that there is no English. Probably it is necessary to teach more English because the English language is everywhere.'

Whereas Russian subordinators are widely spread in informal spoken Udmurt, they are strictly avoided in formal written registers, although *čto* and *potomu čto* used to be part of literary Udmurt in the first half of the 20th century (Vaxrušev et al. 1974: 51, 81). Nowadays the two Russian global copies are replaced by the autochthonous Udmurt complementizer *šujša* 'that' (18) and the former modal construction *malj ke šuono* 'if to say why' (16), respectively. Being actively used as a subordinating conjunction of cause since the forties of the last century (Šutov 2009: 389), the latter always occupies the clause-initial position, unlike other indigenous Udmurt subordinators:

(16) Udmurt (Darali Leli 2009: 27)

Kin-len mılķjd-jz kužmo-ges?
 who-GEN feeling-3SG.POSS strong-COMPARATIVE

1 The phonological integration of the Russian form *xot'*, found in formal Udmurt, often does not take place in the colloquial variety.

As-la-z, *malpa-ško,* *malj ke šuono*
 he.himself-GEN-3SG.POSS think-PRS.1SG because
čup-a-z, *ač-iz* *čup-a-z.*
 kiss-PST-3SG he.himself-3SG.POSS kiss-PST-3SG
 ‘Whose feeling is stronger? His, I think, because he kissed (me), he
 himself kissed (me).’

In colloquial Udmurt the double-marking of subordinate clauses by means of clause-initial Russian copies and clause-final Udmurt forms is rather frequent. For instance, in (17) the conditional clause is framed by the Russian subordinator *jesli* and the Udmurt conjunction *ke* sharing the same meaning and function:

(17) Udmurt (spoken data)

Jesli *kuiń* *ađami* *kořk-i-z* *ke*,
if three person go-PST-3SG if
kuiń *ađami* *kak raz* *prinjat'* *kar-o*.
three person exactly admit AUX-FUT.1SG
'If three persons go, I will admit exactly three persons.' (About the admission to a kindergarten).

According to Kel'makov (2011: 226), such pleonastic use of synonymous function words is caused by the language tendency to intensify the meaning of a clause they frame and results in a more clear organization of subordinated structures. In fact, the emphatic function of double-marking is also suggested by Baran (2002: 25–26) and Werthheim (2003: 338–339) with regard to Uzbek and Tatar, respectively. However, the phenomenon does not seem to be easily explainable through emphasis and requires further analysis. Kel'makov (2011: 226–227) also speculates that the development of frame constructions in Udmurt could have been influenced by the neighbouring Turkic languages (Tatar, Bashkir) in which combinations of prepositive Russian or Persian elements with postpositive Turkic ones are common. Since, however, the double-marking of grammatical functions is found beyond the Volga-Ural region as well (Baran 2000: 25–26, Stolz and Stolz 1997: 22–23) it seems more plausible to regard it as a frequent outcome of a contact between typologically different languages. In this light, Udmurt data make a significant contribution to cross-linguistic research on language contact.

In summary, there are several possibilities in spoken Udmurt to mark subordinated processes via conjunctions, namely, either by a clause-final Udmurt subordinator (18), or by a clause-initial Russian

copy (15) or by a combination of both (19), as the following examples of complement clauses illustrate:

(18) Udmurt (spoken data)

So-je srazu, pe, tod-i-zj, udmur šuiša.
 he-ACC immediately EVIDENTIAL know-PST-3PL Udmurt that
 ‘They said one knew at once that he was Udmurt.’

(19) Udmurt (spoken data)

Vera-j mon so-lj,
 say-PST.1SG I he-DAT
čto ožj kuja-ško-dj vsjakij šuiša.
 that so throw-PRS-2PL various that
 ‘I said to him that they throw everything just like that.’

As indicated above, subordination in Udmurt is, for the most, a matter of structural copying. Russian patterns of subordinate clauses have been adopted and are now used either with indigenous clause-final subordinators or Russian clause-initial copies of linking function words. The latter exist both as selective and global copies and contribute to the increasing use of syntactic structures which formerly used to be less typical of Udmurt.

5. Conclusion

The aim of this paper was to study the adoption of Russian linking devices in Udmurt within the code-copying framework. Russian conjunctions as whole units or their patterns of usage are found today both in coordinate and subordinate Udmurt structures. Moreover, Russian copies participate in linking of all kinds of coordinated and subordinated processes either as the only device available in the language or as one of the options coexisting with indigenous Udmurt forms. Consequently, Udmurt can be considered a “highly copying code” (Johanson 2002: 302) as far as the adoption of Russian conjunctions is concerned.

Furthermore, the sustained intensive contact with Russian has led to structural changes in Udmurt. The increasing use of subordinate clauses of the Russian type along with clause-initial subordinators is contributing substantially to the reshaping of the Udmurt syntax. The fact that the structure of the Udmurt language is being reorganized can be also proved by the development of Udmurt adverbial subordinator

malj ke šuono ‘because’ which occupies the clause-initial position. Thus it does not follow the original Udmurt pattern.

The use of the majority of global copies mentioned above is restricted to spoken informal registers. That does not mean, however, that they are not conventionalized sufficiently to be counted as part of the language system since their use is widely common among speakers of different backgrounds. The fact that Russian global copies are avoided in formal written texts is rather due to prescriptive practices aimed at language purism. For the same reason the Russian subordinators *čto* ‘that’ and *potomu čto* ‘because’, which used to be part of literary Udmurt, have been banned from the formal register. Whereas global copies are often seen as threat to the language, selective copies are not easily recognized as foreign elements and are more likely to become accepted constituents of the formal language system.

A quantitative analysis of conjunctions in colloquial Udmurt is needed to compare the frequency of usage of indigenous forms and their Russian equivalents. In the case Russian linking devices are used predominantly in informal Udmurt, one could speak of a tendential replacement of Udmurt conjunctions, which would be an indication of a new language code with a Russian-like sentence structure.

Address:

Inna Kaysina
University of Bremen
Nollendorferstraße 40
28201 Bremen, Germany
E-mail: kaysina@uni-bremen.de

References

- Baran, Dominika (2000) “The role of Russian function words in urban colloquial Uzbek”. *Texas Linguistic Forum* 44, 1, 18–32.
- Baušev, K. M. (1929) *Sintaksičeskij stroj votskoj reči i genezis častic sojuznogo porjadka*. Moskva and Leningrad: Narodnyj komissariat prosvěščenija RSFSR.
- Csúcs, Sándor (1970) “A votják nyelv orosz jövevényyszavai 1”. *Nyelvtudományi közlemények* 72, 323–362.
- Csúcs, Sándor (1972) “A votják nyelv orosz jövevényyszavai 2”. *Nyelvtudományi közlemények* 74, 27–47.
- Csúcs, Sándor (1988) “Die Wotjakische Sprache”. In D. Sinor, ed. *Handbook of Uralic Studies*. Vol. 1: *The Uralic Languages*, 24–36. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

- Csúcs, Sándor (1990) *Die tatarischen Lehnwörter des Wotjakischen*. Budapest: Akadémiai kiadó.
- Csúcs, Sándor (2002) "Russische Lehnwörter im heutigen Wotjakischen". In R. Blockland and C. Hasselblatt, eds. *Finno-Ugrians and Indo-Europeans: linguistic and literary contacts*, 51–57. Maastricht: Shaker Publishing.
- Csúcs, Sándor (2005) *Die Rekonstruktion der permischen Grundsprache*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Johanson, Lars (2002) "Contact-induced change in a code-copying framework". In Mari C. Jones and Edith Esch, eds. *Language change: the interplay of internal, external and extra-linguistic factors*, 285–313. Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Kalašnikova, Valentina Georgievna (1968) "K ètimologii nekotoryx sojuzov udmurtskogo jazyka". *Učenyje zapiski UGPI* (Iževsk) 18, 141–149.
- Kalašnikova, Valentina Georgievna (1974) *Složnosoičinennye predloženiya v udmurtskom jazyke (v istoričeskom osveščanii)*. Avtoreferat dissertacii na soiskanie učenoj stepeni kandidata filologičeskix nauk. Tartu.
- Kel'makov, Valentin (2000) *Udmurtskij jazyk v tipologičeskom i kontaktologičeskom aspekte*. Iževsk.
- Kel'makov, Valentin (2011) "Ramočnoe upotreblenie sinonimičnyx služebnyx slov v udmurtskom jazyke (v kontekste jazykov uralo-povolžja)". *Congressus XI Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum Piliscsaba, 9–14 VIII 2010*. Pars IV: Dissertationes sectionum: Linguistica, 220–229. Piliscsaba.
- Kirillova, L. E., ed. (2008) *Udmurtsko-russkij slovar'*. Iževsk: Rossijskaja akademija nauk. Ural'skoe otdelenie. Udmurtskij institut istorii, jazyka i literatury.
- Lytkin, V. I., K. E. Majtinskaja, Karoj Redej, eds. (1976) *Osnovy finno-ugorskogo jazykoznanija. Marijskie, permskie i ugorskie jazyki*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Nasibullin, Rif (1995) "Russkie zaimstvovaniya v udmurtskom jazyke dosovetskogo perioda". *Congressus Octavus Internationalis Fenno-Ugristarum 10–15.08.1995*. Pars 2: Summaria acroasium in sectionibus et Symposiis actarum, 146. Jyväskylä.
- Nasibullin, Rif (1998) "Kategorial'nye i morfologičeskie otnošenija zaimstvovannyx slov iz russkogo jazyka". *Vordskem kyl* 5, 36–42.
- Nasibullin, Rif (2002) "Periodizacija russkix zaimstvovanij v udmurtskom jazyke". *Volgan alueen kielikontaktit symposium Turussa 16–18.08.2001*, 167–175. Turku.
- Saarinén, Sirkka (1997) "Language contacts in the Volga region: loan suffixes and calques in Mari and Udmurt". In Heinrich Ramisch and Kenneth Wynne, eds. *Language in time and space: studies in honour of Wolfgang Viereck on the occasion of his 60th birthday*, 388–396. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Schiffrin, Deborah (1987) *Discourse markers*. Cambridge University Press.
- Serebrennikov, Boris A. (1963) *Istoričeskaja morfologija permskix jazykov*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo akademii nauk SSSR.
- Stolz, Christel and Stolz, Thomas (1997) "Universelle Hispanismen? Von Manila über Lima bis Mexiko und zurück: Muster bei der Entlehnung spanischer Funktionswörter in die indigenen Sprachen Amerikas und Astronesiens". *Orbis* 39, 1–77.

- Šutov, Aleksandr Fedorovič (2002) *Puti razvitija gipotaktičeskix otnošenij v udmurtskom jazyke*. disserCat – elektronnaia biblioteka dissertacij. Available online at <<http://www.dissercat.com>>. Accessed on 19.12.2011.
- Šutov, Aleksandr Fedorovič (2009) “K istorii sojuza maly ke šuono v udmurtskom jazyke”. In *Permistika 10: Voprosy permskoj i finno-ugorskoj filologii*, 389–391. GOUVPO Udmurtskij Gosudarstvennyj Universitet. Kafedra obščego i finno-ugorskogo jazykoznanija.
- Thomason, Sarah G. (2001) *Introduction to language contact*. Washington: Georgetown University Press.
- Vaxrušev, V. M., V. N. Zaxarov, L. I. Kalinina, eds. (1974) *Grammatika sovremenogo udmurtskogo jazyka. Sintaksis složnogo predloženiia*. Iževsk: Udmurtija.
- Wertheim, Susanne (2003) *Linguistic purism, language shift, and contact-induced change in Tatar*. Available online at <<http://www.suzannewertheim.com/publications/Front-matter.pdf>>. Accessed on 07.11.2012
- Winkler, Eberhard (2001) *Udmurt*. München: LINCOM EUROPA.

Appendix 1

Corpus of literary Udmurt

- Badretdinov, Ulfat (2007) *Čušjal vordiške veñjostek. Povestʃos, verosʃos*. Iževsk: Udmurtija.
- Darali Leli (2009) *Gur šerjś suredʃos: verosʃos*. Ižkar: Invožo.
- Malyx, Lija (2010) *Šudbergan: verosʃos*. Ižkar: Invožo
- Panfilova, Elena (2008) *Mumj: povestʃ*. Iževsk: Udmurtija.
- Skobelev, Pëtr (2006) *Egizoos. Povestʃos*. Iževsk: Udmurtija.

Kokkuvõte. Inna Kaysina: Vene konjunksioonid udmurdi keeles. Udmurdi keele sidesõnad on hilise päritoluga. Udmurdi oma sidendid on arenenud teistest sõnaklassidest, lisaks on laenatud hulk sidesõnu vene ja tatari keelest tiheda keelekontakti tulemusel. See artikkel tegeleb vene sidesõnadega tänapäeva udmurdi keeles. Vene sidestavaid elemente analüüsitakse koodikopeerimise raamistikus (Johanson 2002) ja neid käsitletakse seega kui kopeeritud üksusi. Arutletakse ka vene keele rolli üle rinnastavate ja alistavate struktuuride arengus udmurdi kõnekeeles.

Märksõnad: keelekontakt, koodikopeerimine, sidendid, alistavad sidesõnad, keele struktuur, udmurdi keel, vene keel